

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/718,679	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SHOREY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Robert C. Scheibel	<b>Art Unit</b> 2666	

**All Participants:**

(1) Robert C. Scheibel.

(2) Mohammad S. Rahman.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 9 May 2005

**Time:** 2:00

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

22 and 29

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The wording of claims 22 and 29 was discussed. Mr. Rahman approved the changes included in the examiner's amendment. The specification and the abstract were also discussed. Mr. Rahman faxed the abstract included in the examiner's amendment. This new abstract removes the legal phraseology and better represents the amended claims..